



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,102	08/26/2003	Kim Ngoc Vu	C1138-700110	6429
7590	11/04/2005		EXAMINER	
Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr. Lowrie, Lando & Anastasi, LLP One Main Street Cambridge, MA 02142			FOX, JOHN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/650,102	VU, KIM NGOC
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Fox	3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 18-34 and 37 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 16, 17, 35, 36 and 38-41 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Claims 42-59 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on August 25, 2005.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no additional burden to examine 18 more claims. This is not found persuasive because it is inaccurate.

It should be self-evident that examining 59 claims is a greater burden than examining 41 claims.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 and 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al '546, of record, in view of Ohmi et al '871.

Eidsmore et al show a gas stick system with substrates 40 having transverse channels 41 which take manifolds, or bridge fittings in the language of the patent, to make connections between adjacent sticks. In the embodiment of Figure 7, such transverse manifolds include the end fittings labeled 46, which has a port in a plane transverse to the top plane which contains the ports communicating with the components. Eidsmore et al show in Figure 7 a four bolt mounting pattern for the three

way and two way valves. Eidsmore et al, though, use bridge fittings for the gas sticks on the inlet side of the MFC. Ohmi et al show another gas stick where the inlet side of the MFC can be either a substrate/manifold or an integral block. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used an integral block instead of the substrate/manifold in Eidsmore et al, as for the inlet side of the MFC, in view of the equivalence taught by Ohmi et al.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al in view of Ohmi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Symington.

Eidsmore et al, as modified, teach the claimed device except for testing for leakage. Symington teaches a gas stick apparatus including a base plate with means to test the apparatus for a gas leak. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such a base plate with the device of Eidsmore et al, as modified, to provide for leak testing therein.

Claims 16-17, 35-36, and 38-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on 571-272-4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753